

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner has required election in the present application between:

Group A, claims 1, 3, and 4, allegedly drawn to a metallic member molded to the inner wheel of the bearing of a rotor; and

Group B, claim 2, allegedly drawn to a metallic member molded directly to the rotor shaft and abutting against the metallic member.

**For the purpose of examination of the present application, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group A, Claims 1, 3, and 4.**

The Examiner's election requirement mischaracterizes the alleged inventions of groups A and B. The Examiner's characterizations of both of these groups contains limitations not present anywhere in the independent claims. None of the limitations present in original claim 2 are inconsistent with the limitations of independent claim 1. Consequently, to demonstrate that claim 2 is merely a further limitation of claim 1, claim 2 has been amended by this response to make this claim dependent upon original independent claim 1 without substantively altering the scope of original claim 2. From this amendment, it is apparent that original claim 1 cannot be considered a different species from original claim 2 since original claim 1 included limitations that were all present in original claim 2.

It is unclear how the Examiner has interpreted claims 1 and 2 as requiring the "metallic member molded directly to a rotor shaft and abutting against the metallic member" and the metallic member molded to the inner wheel of a bearing of a rotor". However, neither of these limitations are present in either of the independent claims. Thus, it is clear that the Examiner's election of species requirement is flawed.

For the reasons set forth above reconsideration and withdraw of the outstanding election requirement and examination of all claims is respectfully requested.

Regardless of the Examiner's conclusion about the outstanding election requirement, however, since claim 2 is now a dependent claim, depending on independent claim 1, it must be rejoined to this application prior to issuance if its parent claim 1 is found allowable.

Favorable action on all claims in earnestly solicited

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael K. Mutter, Registration No 29,680 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants